1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Doc. 6

Document 6 Filed 01/13/2006 HONORABLE EDWARD F. SHEA ANDREW C. SMYTHE, WSBA #7948 PAINE, HAMBLEN, COFFIN. **BROOKE & MILLER LLP** 717 West Sprague Avenue, Suite 1200 Spokane, Washington 99201-3505 (509) 455-6000 Attorneys for Defendant Brodhead UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON THOMAS A. WAITE, No. CV-05-399-EFS Plaintiff, ANSWER OF DEFENDANT vs. STEVEN BRODHEAD THE CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST OF LATTER DAY SAINTS d/b/a/ CORPORATION OF THE PRESIDING BISHOP OF THE CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST OF LATTER DAY SAINTS. a S Utah Corporation, d/b/a CORPORATION OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST OF LATTER DAY SAINTS, a Utah corporation; DONALD C. FOSSUM; and STEVEN C. BRODHEAD, Defendant. Defendant Steven C. Brodhead, by and through his attorney, Andrew C. Complaint as follows: I. Regarding plaintiff's Complaint, Section 1.4, defendant admits 1.1

Smythe, of Paine, Hamblen, Coffin, Brooke & Miller LLP answer plaintiff's

that he was a resident of the State of Washington at the time of the accident, but was a resident of the State of Idaho at the time this Complaint was filed.

26 27

28

ANSWER OF DEFENDANT STEVEN BRODHEAD - PAGE 1

PAINE, HAMBLEN, COFFIN, BROOKE & MILLER LLP 717 WEST SPRAGUE AVENUE, SUITE 1200 SPOKANE, WASHINGTON 99201-3505 PHONE (509) 455-6000

1.2 Regarding plaintiff's Complaint Section 3.1, defendant answers as follows:

- Defendant Brodhead drove a Honda.
- The assertion that defendant Fossum was an agent of the defendant LDS Church to which defendant Brodhead has insufficient knowledge and therefore denies.
- The assertion that there were no visual obstructions for observing traffic approaching from the left to which defendant Brodhead asserts that there was a tree at a corner of the intersection and that he does not have sufficient information to know whether there were any visual obstructions and therefore denies the same.
- The assertion that plaintiff was severely and permanently injured in the crash to which defendant Brodhead admits that there were serious injuries suffered by plaintiff as a result of the accident, but since he is not aware of the extent of the severity of permanence of injuries, denies those portions of that assertion.
- Defendant Brodhead denies the remainder of this section of plaintiff's
 Complaint.
- 1.3 Regarding plaintiff's Complaint, Section 8.1, defendant Brodhead admits that plaintiff suffered injuries but does not know the extent nor

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

permanence of those injuries and whether they have any affect on plaintiff's ability to earn an income in the future and therefore denies the assertions of this section of plaintiff's Complaint except for the fact of injuries.

II.

2.1 Defendant Brodhead has insufficient information to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of plaintiff's Complaint Sections 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.1, 4.1, 5.1, 6.1, 6.2, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4, 7.5, 7.6 and therefore denies the same.

III.

3.1 Defendant Brodhead denies any portions of plaintiff's Complaint not specifically addressed in this answer (except plaintiff's Complaint Sections 9.1, 10.1).

IV.

- 4.1 BY WAY OF FURTHER ANSWER TO PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT, defendant Brodhead asserts that plaintiff was guilty of comparative negligence by knowingly becoming an unrestrained passenger in the cargo portion of a pickup truck upon the public roads in the State of Washington.
- 4.2 BY WAY OF FURTHER ANSWER TO PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT, defendant Brodhead asserts that plaintiff's injuries and damages are the proximate result of actions of other persons or entities to be established during the course of discovery.

	Case 2:05-cv-00399-EFS	
1		
$\frac{1}{2}$	v.	
2	5.1 A jury trial is requested.	
3		
4	WHEREFORE, having fully answered plaintiff's Complaint, defendant	
5		
6 7	Brodhead prays as follows:	
8	1. That plaintiff's damages be reduced by the percentage of his own	
9	fault;	
10	2. That plaintiff's damages proximately caused other entities or persons	
11		
12	as may be developed through the course of discovery in this case not be attribute	
13	to defendant Brodhead; and	
14	3. For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and equitable.	
15	DATED this 13th day of January, 2006.	
16		
17	PAINE HAMRIEN COFFIN	
18	PAINE, HAMBLEN, COFFIN, BROOKE & MILLER LLP	
19		
20	By: \s\ Andrew C. Smythe Andrew C. Smythe, WSBA #7948 Attorneys for Defendant Brodhead	
21	Attorneys for Defendant Brodhead	
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28	ANSWER OF DEFENDANT PAINE, HAMBLEN, COFFIN, BROOKE & MILLER LLP 717 WEST SPRAGUE AVENUE, SUITE 1200 SPOKANE, WASHINGTON 199201, 2505 PHONE (500) 455, 6000	

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on the <u>13th</u> day of January, 2006, I electronically filed the foregoing Answer of Defendant Steven Brodhead, with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF System which will send notification of such filing to the

Richard C. Eymann <u>eymann@eahjlaw.com</u>

and I hereby certify that I have mailed by United States Postal Service the document to the following non CM/ECF participants:

Stephen Layne Nordstrom Ford Nees & Nordstrom South 323 Pines Road Spokane, WA 99206-0495

1

2

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

following:

\s\ ANDREW C. SMYTHE

Andrew C. Smythe, WSBA No. 7948
Attorney for Defendant
Paine, Hamblen, Coffin, Brooke, &
Miller LLP
717 West Sprague Avenue, Suite 1200
Spokane, Washington 99201-3505
509-455-6000
509-838-0007 (facsimile)
andy.smythe@painehamblen.com

I:\Spodocs\91111\00146\plead\00379065.DOC:kc:kmb

ANSWER OF DEFENDANT STEVEN BRODHEAD - PAGE 5 PAINE, HAMBLEN, COFFIN, BROOKE & MILLER LLP 717 WEST SPRAGUE AVENUE, SUITE 1200 SPOKANE, WASHINGTON 99201-3505 PHONE (509) 455-6000